

The Sun

SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| DAILY, Per Year | \$5.00 |
| DAILY, Per Month | 50 Cts. |
| SUNDAY, Per Year | 2.00 |
| SUNDAY, Per Month | 20 Cts. |
| DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year | 8.00 |
| DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month | 75 Cts. |

Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Laffan, 170 Nassau street, Secretary of the Association, Franklin Hartlett, 5 Nassau street.

The daily and Sunday Sun is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland avenue; at Mail American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and at the American Agency, 17 Green street, Leicester square.

Paris office, 32 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 7, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera, and Kiosque 18, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

No Backward Step!

From President Roosevelt's annual message of 1908. Whenever either corporation, labor union or individual disregards the law or acts in a spirit of arbitrary and tyrannous interference with the rights of others, whether corporations or individuals, then where the Federal Government has jurisdiction it will see to it that the misconduct is stopped, paying not the slightest heed to the position or power of the corporation, the union or the individual, but only to one vital fact—that is, the question whether or not the conduct of the individual or aggregate of individuals is in accordance with the law of the land.

Every man must be guaranteed his liberty and his right to do as he likes with his property or his labor, so long as he does not infringe the rights of others. No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it. Obedience to the law is demanded as a right, not asked as a favor.

We have cause as a nation to be thankful for the steps that have been so successfully taken to put these principles into effect. The progress has been by evolution, not by revolution. Nothing radical has been done; the action has been both moderate and resolute. Therefore the work will stand. There shall be no backward step.

Mr. Roosevelt's New Attack on the Courts.

In his last special message—unless one has been sent to Congress while we are writing—Mr. Roosevelt renews his menacing assault upon the courts of the United States and strenuously attempts to sap public confidence in their decisions. He repeats his vague charge that "in a number of cases this power [of injunction] has been used to the grave injury of the rights of laboring men."

In a previous special message it was stated that the writ of injunction "has sometimes been abused heedlessly and unjustly and that some of the injunctions issued inflict grave and occasionally irreparable wrong upon those enjoined."

Both these statements are false. In his attacks upon the Federal courts Mr. Roosevelt has failed to specify a single instance in which the writ of injunction has been thus "abused heedlessly and unjustly," and this failure to specify concrete instances is the more remarkable as the President in his many railing accusations against predatory wealth generally fortifies his argument by instances furnished him by special attorneys, bureau chiefs or secret investigators.

In any normal state of public opinion the President would be required to specify the Judge who had thus abused his judicial power, to the end that he might be formally impeached, might have a fair trial in accordance with the Constitution, and if found guilty might be dismissed from his high office. The gross injustice of exposing the entire American judiciary to the contempt and hatred of a portion of the American people by generalizations too vague to admit of specific denial requires no comment.

In his last message the President amplifies his indictment of the judiciary and strikes a still deadlier blow at its authority and dignity. He would not only limit the power of injunction, which the courts have exercised for the preservation of property for more than five hundred years, but would restrict that which is even more fundamental and vital, the right to punish for contempt. He advocates the revolutionary experiment of taking from the Judge whose authority has been mocked and whose very office has been insulted the power to punish those who thus put the majesty of law to an open shame. He recommends that the trial of contempt proceedings, except in special instances, shall be conducted by another Judge. This would mean that the Judge whose decree is defied and authority spat upon must step down from the bench, possibly appear as a witness against the wrongdoer and virtually litigate with him the question of the authority of the Court. Fortunately, like many other recommendations of Mr. Roosevelt, the Constitution declares that "the judicial power of the United States" shall be vested in certain courts and that it shall "extend to all cases in law and equity." In these courts, when created by Congress, the Constitution itself—and not Congress—vests this judicial power. What Congress does not give it cannot take away. Inherent in such power is the prevention of wrong by the writ of injunction and the vindication of authority by punishment for contempt. Congress could not take away these essential attributes of a court if it would, and we believe it would not if it could, all these special messages of Theodore Roosevelt.

The Constitution declares that "the judicial power of the United States" shall be vested in certain courts and that it shall "extend to all cases in law and equity." In these courts, when created by Congress, the Constitution itself—and not Congress—vests this judicial power. What Congress does not give it cannot take away. Inherent in such power is the prevention of wrong by the writ of injunction and the vindication of authority by punishment for contempt. Congress could not take away these essential attributes of a court if it would, and we believe it would not if it could, all these special messages of Theodore Roosevelt.

and the clamorous appeals of SAMUEL GOMPERS to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Supreme Court in the Debs case thus clearly demonstrated the futility of such legislation:

"The power to even imprison for contempt from the earliest history of jurisprudence has been regarded as a necessary incident and attribute of a court, without which it could no more exist than a judge. It is a power inherent in all courts of record and coexistent with them by wise provisions of common law. A court without the power effectively to protect itself against the assaults of the lawless or to enforce its orders, judgments or decrees against the recalcitrant parties before it would be a disgrace to the Legislature and a stigma upon the age which invented it."

We especially commend the last sentence of this unanimous opinion to the careful consideration of Congress.

To the great iconoclast it is a slight thing to attack these inherent powers of a court of justice. If Congress were so servile as to adopt such revolutionary recommendations the courts would in their own time and way protect their constitutional rights as an independent although coordinate department of the Government.

We have too much respect for Mr. Roosevelt's political foresight to believe that he expects or wishes that these radical recommendations will receive any sanction at the hands of Congress. The recommendation is merely a verbal sop to organized labor, which in the political exigencies of the hour must be placated at any cost, even though that cost be the degradation of the judiciary and the partial destruction of confidence in its justice. Mr. Roosevelt—true type of the crafty politician "who would circumvent God"—is willing, for his own political interests, to delude organized labor into the belief that its members are the victims of an unjust abuse of judicial power and that he favors putting the courts in a straitjacket for their benefit.

Nothing is more extraordinary in this special message than the base reasons with which he commends his revolutionary policies to the attention of Congress. He specifies no proposed modification of the procedure in injunction cases; he gives no specific instances of abuses of the writ; he even fails to give any reason for his unwarranted conclusion that the writ of injunction has been used "heedlessly and unjustly." The real motive for his recommendation is betrayed in this remarkable sentence:

"They are blind who fail to realize the extreme bitterness caused among large bodies of worthy citizens by the use that has been repeatedly made of the power of injunction in labor disputes."

The "worthy citizens" in question are SAMUEL GOMPERS and JOHN MITCHELL, who boldly claim a peculiar right on the part of organized labor to interfere with the property rights of others and especially with the right of the independent wage earner to work except as their bondmen. The courts must be crippled that the sacred right of free riot and the more infamous thuggery of the boycott may be freely exercised to reduce the employer and independent wage earner to a state of subservience to the labor oligarchy of which SAMUEL GOMPERS is the ruling spirit. It is these "worthy citizens" who, on their own admissions, have recently been adjudged by the Supreme Court of the United States to be criminal violators of the Sherman anti-trust law and for whose benefit and to secure whose votes THEODORE ROOSEVELT has deliberately and avowedly suspended the operations of that law by an unprecedented direction to his Attorney-General and District Attorneys not to enforce its salutary provisions against lawless labor unions. This service—the like of which has never before been known in American politics—should have been sufficient to allay any "bitterness" of these "worthy citizens," and to secure their much needed votes. Now on the eve of a Presidential election they must be further placated by restricting the vital powers of the courts to grant injunctions and punish for contempt.

Blinded as his political conscience is, Mr. Roosevelt mildly agrees that the bitterness of any class is no justification for a law that would grievously oppress other classes, and he proceeds, in his characteristic manner, to say:

"It may be and often is the duty of a court, a Legislature or an Executive to resist and defy a gross popular passion, and most certainly no public servant, whatever may be the consequences to himself, should yield to what he thinks wrong."

but, he adds,

"In a question which is emphatically one of public policy, the policy which the public commonsense is sure in the end to be adopted."

"In a democracy like ours it is idle to expect permanently to thwart the determination of the great body of our citizens."

Therefore, he implicitly argues, organized labor should have what it asks, without questioning too closely the wisdom of its demands. Such reasoning is characteristic of the demagogue, whose highest purpose and wisdom always it is to give the people what they seem to want.

Still more indefensible is his suggestion that his recommendations that the courts be crippled present only questions of "public policy" and are not matters of right or wrong. The very contrary is the case. The power of the courts to restrain wrong and their power to vindicate their own authority by punishing those who contemptuously defy it are not merely matters of "public policy," but are supremely moral in their nature. If a lawless labor organization is, as in the Pullman strike of 1894, tearing up tracks, destroying switches, derauling burning cars, menacing life, destroying trade, paralyzing commerce, inflicting incalculable and irreparable losses upon innocent investors, is not the prevention of such an outrage to the rights of property and the liberty of individuals something more than a question of "public policy," like a tariff schedule or a currency law?

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, whose mind is essentially lawless in character and to whom restraints of law are meaningless abstractions and its judgments solemn platitudes, may regard the preservation of the independence of the judiciary as a mere question of "public policy" and involving no moral element; but, unless the spirit of the American people has changed far more than we have any

reason to suspect, this law abiding people will refuse to believe that the great preventive writ of injunction and the power to punish for contempt—the right and left arms of the courts in the administration of justice—are merely economic questions and may be impaired merely to appease the clamorous "bitterness" of any special class.

Nothing is better calculated to embitter the manual toilers than the belief that they suffer any peculiar injustice at the hands of the courts. They are for the most part law abiding men and believe in their country and respect its institutions. Let them, however, once lose faith in the equal and unpurchased administration of justice between man and man and they will turn and rend our form of government. It is this fact which makes Mr. Roosevelt's repeated assaults upon the fairness of the courts in labor controversies so infinitely mischievous. In his last message he well says: "The demagogue * * * who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people does a foul and evil thing, for he is no true American * * * who erects the doctrine of class hatred into a shibboleth."

The Massachusetts Democrats.

It may be doubted whether Mr. FREDERIC JESUP STIMSON will ever forgive the Hon. GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS, Mr. BRYAN's factotum in Massachusetts, for inviting him to preside over the Democratic State convention in Faneuil Hall. It was a select gathering in the sense that only 632 of 1,927 delegates entitled to seats were present, and being confined mainly to friends of Mr. WILLIAMS, some of whom are described by the local press as "strong armed men" left over from the rough house convention at Springfield last year, it was no place for literary fellows like Mr. STIMSON and Professor ALEXANDER F. CHAMBERLAIN of Clark University.

We suspect that Mr. STIMSON, who is a fellow townsman of WILLIAMS, both residing in Dedham, was beguiled into taking the gavel to lend dignity and respectability to the proceedings. If Mr. STIMSON wanted local color for one of his ingenious works of fiction he was not disappointed. In the pauses of the fighting the delegates sang "I'm Afraid to Go Home in the Dark." The chairman was called more names by vulgar partisans than he had ever heard at the old North End. And then the delegates were unruly and would not stay in their seats. We quote from a report of the deliberations when an acute stage had been reached:

"A dozen men rose to points of order. Pandemonium reigned, but the chairman continued with the appointment of tellers. The band started up, while everybody surged toward the stage."

Mr. STIMSON is neither leather lunged nor strong armed, and he did not know what to do with the crisis until a voice prompted him: "Clear the platform, JIMMY." Accordingly Mr. STIMSON, whose name is not JIMMY, called in the police and the usurpation from the floor ceased. But Mr. STIMSON's troubles were not over. His decision on a year and a half ago brought ex-Alderman DAN FLAUGAN raging down the centre aisle, blood in his eye and his arms swinging like flails. DAN shook a large forefinger under the chairman's nose, and peace was restored only when Mr. STIMSON allowed him a roll call. The eruption of Professor CHAMBERLAIN must also have been embarrassing. He is an anthropologist, antiquarian and specialist in folklore, member of many learned societies, and like Mr. STIMSON, a voluminous writer. The professor, despite objections and insults, climbed the platform and roared out:

"If Roosevelt is a tyrant, your chairman is a tyrant to-day. I am a delegate and I am a Democrat, and I ask for permission to protest against the instruction of delegates for WILLIAM J. BRYAN, Men of Massachusetts, do not tie the hands of your delegates, but leave them free. If you do we will have a Democratic President in the next election. If you tie their hands the party will be as dead as the man you propose to endorse."

We have examined Mr. STIMSON's rulings and find no evidence of usurpation in the record. He behaved, as MARTIN LOMAX says, like "a scholarly gentleman." He was eminently fair, courteous, mild and painstaking. His address on constitutional limitations deserved a much better hearing than it received from the delegates. But the convention was not truly representative of the Democratic party in Massachusetts. Chairman STIMSON was hardly in the company he likes best, and Professor CHAMBERLAIN was as a voice crying in the wilderness. The truth is the machinery of the party has been turned over to GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS for the second time by the conservatives, who are tired of doing the work, paying the bills and being betrayed. Nowhere else is the Democratic party sunk in such lethargy and dejection. Under the leadership of WILLIAMS in 1897 it polled only 79,552 votes with that worthy as its candidate for Governor. Nothing but the defeat of BRYAN in the national convention will save the Democratic party in Massachusetts from extinction this time.

The Great Stewart Mystery.

Now that Senator RAYNER of Maryland has taken up the case of Colonel WILLIAM F. STEWART of the Coast Artillery we may expect some interesting revelations. There is much to be said on both sides of the question, but in our opinion very little in favor of the precise manner of the Colonel's discipline. That, we think, might easily have been managed otherwise.

It will be recalled that THE SUN first called attention to the Colonel's exile at Fort Grant, an abandoned army post in Arizona, twenty-six miles from the nearest railway and ten miles distant from any human habitation. He was sent there last October with one man to look after him, his only apparent sin consisting in a stern refusal to apply for retirement after forty years of service. Of course that was not all, for the army seldom, if ever, wishes to get rid of eligible officers, but it was all the public could ascertain definitely, and with that we had to be content. Meanwhile the man could not be retired against his wish. He still lacked three or four years of the statutory age of 64 and he refused to ask for

retirement on the score of forty years of service. The expedient had been suggested to him by headquarters and he had respectfully but firmly declined unless he was to be retired as a Brigadier-General—something not to be considered in the Department's scheme. So the Colonel, silent, imperturbable, uncompromising, packed his traps, went out to Fort Grant with the wolves, the coyotes and the chaparral and sat him down and waited.

Some weeks ago THE SUN took notice of the case, controversy followed, and about ten days ago Colonel STEWART was transferred to an old abandoned fort in Florida where at least he would have the freedom of the nearby city of St. Augustine. But hardly had he reached there and begun to unstrap his trunks, bags, &c., when he got orders to return to Fort Grant. He promptly obeyed. Presumably by this time he is there or thereabouts. He has had a more or less interesting journey of 6,000 or 7,000 miles and no doubt feels vastly refreshed in consequence, and there he is, or soon will be again, just where he began. Apparently he is the bagatelle of the moment which the War Department finds it amusing to speed. He is saying nothing, however. Maybe he is something else.

Meanwhile Senator RAYNER has taken up the case and seems disposed to press it. Perhaps we shall at last hear all the facts, a consummation much to be desired. The spectacle of a Colonel of the Coast Artillery banished about from one side of the country to the other, consigned to a remote and painful exile from civilization, cloistered from all human companionship and sympathy, and all this without a reason that can be or has been explained—this is a spectacle that naturally excites wonder. Evidently Colonel STEWART has done nothing for which he can be court-martialed. Presumably he has not laid himself open to a court of inquiry. But clearly he has done something—something which the Department wishes to punish secretly and hesitates to deal with openly.

What, then, are WILLIAM F. STEWART'S offences and where are the defects in our military system which permit or require these evasive and underhand methods?

The Trouble With Bradley.

Despatches from Kentucky assert that Senator-elect WILLIAM O. BRADLEY, leader of the Fairbanks supporters in that State, had many friends among the Taft delegates to the State convention who wished to have him sent to the Chicago convention as a delegate at large, but that they were defeated because of Mr. BRADLEY'S "inflammatory speeches." Mr. BRADLEY is one of the most powerful orators in his State, and his enthusiasm must have led him frequently into extreme utterances.

How distasteful these would be to the adherents of Mr. TAFT is obvious. The Secretary himself is the candidate and representative of a man whose moderation of statement, whose restraint in the choice of adjectives, nouns and verbs, has made deep impression on his countrymen and the intelligent and studious men of all nations on earth.

The more fact that Senator BRADLEY is opposed to the selection of Mr. TAFT as the Republican candidate for President, therefore, has nothing to do with his defeat at Louisville.

Now that the Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT stands upon a peak in Darien while Senator MITCHELL is helping him discover the Pacific in the banquet hall of the Fairmont Hotel, and the President naturalizes at Pine Knot, who bosses our War establishment in Washington?

"Johnson carries Minnesota," as is his custom. "Bryanites disrupt Massachusetts Democracy," as is their custom. Will Denver favor carriage or smash?

Business Man's View of a Political Agitator.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: You most kindly sent me your leading editorial to-day. Mr. Roosevelt's charge is a pall of death over the business initiative and energy of the whole country, and I make the assertion, without any fear of successful contradiction, that no one man in the history of this country has done the harm to legitimate business interests as this man has by his reckless, thoughtless methods. F. H. S.

BROOKLYN, May 8.

When to Sweep the Streets.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: If the Street Cleaning Department were alive to the possibilities and advantages of street cleaning during a rain storm it would have its men out in full force, using their brooms during the present downpour. One sweeping on a day like this is worth twenty in dry weather, since the dirt will be carried into the sewers by the broom aided rivulets.

The benefit to the public health would be striking, to say nothing of the beauty of a really clean asphalt, since the green lichen dust carried by the prevalent high winds is responsible for a great amount of infection disease. As it is, the vast amount of rain water is allowed to escape into the sewers unutilized, and the accumulation of dirt and filth and sweepings remains just where it was, to be dry out in the next sunshine and to be distributed by the next wind into the mouths, noses, eyes and ears of a helpless community. Policemen, firemen, letter carriers do their duty in the rain; why not the "white wings"? A. H. P.

NEW YORK, May 7.

The Decadent Oyster.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: When we could get decent oysters, oysters really fit to eat, men did not talk of cooking them. Such a suggestion would have been the signal for an uprising, a revolution among the lovers of good eating. Now oysters, fattened, bleached and bloated as they are before serving, are unfit to eat without being subjected to some process designed to conceal their flabbiness and to give to them a flavor in place of the great salt. But the oyster is not necessary to the preparation of such dishes. A job of putty would do as well.

Cooked oysters are for those who love their wine. Gentlemen know better. BETHABOD BAY.

NEW YORK, May 8.

On the Sands of Time.

Robinson Crusoe had just found the footprint. "It isn't Roosevelt's," he exclaimed, "because it isn't going backward."

Reassured, he continued his search.

A Tragic Tale.

A very reckless Hotentot lived in a distant land. To fend him from the elements he simply wore a smile.

He put it on when he fell. The chilly breeze blew and then he wore it to the grave.

The dreary winter was a bit too warm. Perhaps it grew a little too warm.

He soothed his wife's advice, and when the first spring day arrived he peeped it in a trice.

A cold wave followed after that. Before another noon, Pneumonia claimed the Hotentot. Who took it off to the tomb?

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

THE GENESIS OF OUR FREIGHT RATES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: The lectures on the present railway situation by Logan G. McPherson at Columbia University exemplify anew that fundamental progress in the affairs of man is a natural evolution which does not arise from laws made by men but to which laws made by men must ultimately conform. Before there was an interstate commerce law the action and reaction, one upon another, of the railroads and the waterways, the geographical locations, the physical limitations, the material needs and the economic resources of each section of the United States had developed for each section a system of freight rates peculiarly adapted to its peculiar needs. Throughout its existence the Interstate Commerce Commission has not overthrown and has not seriously modified any one of these freight rate structures that are the development of economic and not of human law. Inoculated with popular error, it attacked a dozen or more years ago the Southern basing point system, but the railroads stood their ground and the Supreme Court of the United States overruled the commission. Even under the Hepburn law the commission has sought no radical readjustment except to renew its efforts to obtain a uniform classification for the entire country, an effort which the railroads themselves with good speed, even although the traffic officers are staggered by the details of the defiant problem.

The freight rate structures of the United States, outlined as a whole and in their relation for the first time by Mr. McPherson, as firmly illustrate the working of the infinite energy to fitting ends as does the growth of the alphabet or the banking system, or any other instrument that has developed in advance of the enactment of legislators. New England must live upon her small manufactures, bring raw material from without and market products beyond her borders. Hence the blanket rate system, which places all New England on a parity in so far as railroad rates are concerned, and on a practical parity with the competing region of New York, north of New Jersey and western Pennsylvania.

The eastern and western lines between the north Atlantic seaboard and Chicago and St. Louis have developed the trunk line percentage system, fairly adjusting the transportation charge to and from every intermediate point. Beyond Chicago and St. Louis, where the traffic channels break, radiating to and converging from the Northwest, West and Southwest, have developed fixed relations between the rates to and from different cities that are held in equilibrium by the contending commercial forces.

In the South, where the railroads are beset by the competition of the coastwise vessels of the ocean and the Gulf on the east and south, and by the competition, actual or potential, of the Ohio and the Mississippi rivers on the north and west, where the traffic channels extend east and west, north and south, northeast and southwest, the railroads have been obliged to focus competition on certain "basing points." Competition between the merchants who send their wares northward from the Gulf and the merchants who send their wares southward from Memphis, St. Louis, Chicago and other cities to the north, gives Texas a system of freight rates peculiar to itself and its needs. The rail rates on the manufactured products of the East to the Pacific Coast are kept down by the steamships, and the conditions imposed by the markets keep down the rates on the fruits of California to the East.

These general freight rate structures of the different regions are traversed by special freight rates that have grown to meet the particular needs of the great staple commodities that move in vast volumes for general consumption. The rates on grain and grain products, on meat and meat products, are so delicately adjusted that these commodities move with but a minimum of friction. The raw material of manufacture and manufactured products move from every place of production to their markets without hindrance from freight rates. There increases a decentralization of distribution through which the retail dealer and his patrons obtain the merchandise of daily need with greater ease from the source of supply.

As progress is not attained in any field at any time or place without that struggle which leads to the survival of the fittest these freight rate adjustments are the result of long fought rate wars, of tests of strength between the shippers of the various cities and between the different railroads. After wars come treaties of peace, the crystallization of experience into law. This stage in railroad development was marked by the formation of traffic associations and traffic agreements whose prohibition is now generally recognized even by President ROOSEVELT to have been a mistake.

The processes of this development have been of every other development, have not been without incidental injury now and then in one direction or another, and not without a measure of that positive abuse which has not been absent from any development recorded by history. That invidious and unjust practices should be prohibited and penalized is beyond question; and it is gratifying to remember, the misrepresentations of politicians and popular misconception to the contrary notwithstanding, that the railroads themselves sought the enactment of the sound and stable portions of the Hepburn law. That there must be provision for the enforcement of prohibitions and penalties is also above question, and here again it is gratifying to know that so far as the correction of unjust rates is concerned, the bill during that year and one-third, on April 11, 1906, 20 per cent. had been decided in favor of the complainant, 27 per cent. in favor of the defendant railroads, 10 per cent. had been compromised or adjusted and withdrawn, and 43 per cent. of the total remained undecided.

What better proof could there be that the docket of the Interstate Commerce Commission bears to the freight rate structure of the country and to the vast traffic moving thereunder only about the same relation that the docket of a Justice of the Peace bears to the conduct of an orderly community?

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

NEW YORK, May 8.

The Difference.

Knicker—The business men cry: "Let us alone." Schenck—And the administration cries: "Let us alone."

McLARDEN WILSON.

SCHOOL BOOK ILLUSTRATIONS.

Comments of a Practical Man on the Plates in Use To-day.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: As a practical wood engraver and father of half grown plates, as well as the father of two boys who probably will soon be in a public school, I wish to add something to the discussion of school book illustrations now attracting the attention of school authorities, publishers, and parents.

It seems to be conceded that pictures and paper as now produced are injurious to the eyes. A duller finish to the paper is called for, and this means other methods of illustration. There are three methods that are available: wood engraving, half tone, and photo-lithography or half tone as it is commonly called.

Wood engravings well done are the most artistic, the most printable and the most durable of all illustrations. There is a brilliancy of contrasting lights and shadows and richness of color in them that can be secured in no other way.

The direct process for reproducing pen and ink work is sharp, clean and printable; but if books were full of pen and ink work they would look like monotonous.

Half tone plates can be well worked up by hand tooling that they do not require glazed surfaces for good printing. In some cases the entire surface of a half tone plate should be engraved by hand. Light skies and bright surfaces and details should nearly always be engraved by hand.

There are enough wood engravers left to do all the school book work if wood engraving is desired, or to do any amount of engraving on half tone plates.

The universal use of the direct process seems to be out of the question for the reason that the use of photographs from nature, from objects and from old and modern master paintings. Besides it would exclude oil or wash paintings and drawings and thus seriously limit artists in their materials.

Half tone plates—wood engraving, direct process and half tone—should be used with such liberality and skill that the children will have the benefit of the best pictures that art can furnish not only for the sake of their eyes but for their general culture.

Some of the latest plates in modern school book machinery are a disgrace to twentieth century art and printing. Where wood engraving is used the engraver usually so greatly reduced from the original drawings that they have little value. Many half tone plates look like a blotchy mess, too, in spite of their coming from thoroughly up to date printing plants equipped with the best of the latest process.

It seems a poor excuse, because school books need not be rushed out like a newspaper.